

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated Oct. 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 16, 2007

REMARKS

The following Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed July 16, 2007. Applicant appreciates Examiner's further careful review of the present application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin Lizée et al (US 5,671,404, hereinafter "Lizée") in view of Atsushi Kanaegami et al (US 5,297,039, hereinafter "Kanaegami").

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-3. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

Claim 1 recites in part:

'a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark'.

Applicant submits that any combination of Lizée and Kanaegami does not teach or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted feature, as set forth in claim 1.

Lizée teaches that a query condition as herein defined is any Boolean condition which is used for querying objects (col. 5, lines 11-22). A query is defined here as a conjunction of query conditions, and the query searches for common retrieval objects responding positively to all its query conditions (col. 5, lines 23-25). The retrieval objects would correspond to documents, a query condition is the presence of a specific word or its equivalent word expression in a

Appl. No. 10/749,311

Amdt. Dated Oct. 13, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed July 16, 2007

document and a query is a list of desired words with their equivalents (col. 5, lines 26-35). A computer generates a report of a query search, writes the query conditions of the automatically relaxable query (ARQ), specifies the query conditions which were marked, identifies a record and the retrieval objects found (col. 6, lines 64-67).

According to these disclosures of Lizée, the query is defined as a conjunction of the query conditions, and the retrieval objects corresponding to documents are searched from a database according to the query conditions. The report (also representing the structure information report of the present application) is generated according to the retrieval objects searched. The query conditions can be marked and specified. However, there is no teaching or suggestion about *an identified field of the report*. In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion about *a designated mark that is used to mark the identified field of the report*. That is, Lizée fails to teach or suggest the feature of **“a marking sub-module for marking an identified field of the structured information report with a designated mark,”** as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, applicant submits that Kanaegami does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either. It is submitted that any combination of Lizée and Kanaegami does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites in part:

‘a scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report’.

Applicant submits that any combination of Lizée and Kanaegami does not teach or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted feature, as set forth in claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/749,311

Amdt. Dated Oct. 13, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed July 16, 2007

Kanaegami teaches a text information extraction method that includes a step of preparing and storing a concept template, a step of preparing and storing a complementary template, a step of inputting a text, a step of analyzing the text by means of a dictionary and preparing an analysis network, a step of adding related words of an element to the analysis network by means of a related word dictionary, a step of matching each line of the analysis network with each line of the concept template, a step of complementing the analysis network, and a step of outputting the analysis network (col. 2, line 67-col. 3, line 42).

According to these steps of Kanaegami, the text information extraction method is for extracting analysis networks from texts and storing the analysis networks in a database. The analysis networks consist of lines, and each line includes elements and relations extracted from the texts. However, there is no teaching or suggestion about a step of *scanning a structured information report*. That is, Kanaegami fails to teach or suggest the feature of **"a scanning sub-module for scanning the structured information report,"** as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, applicant submits that Lizée does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either. It is submitted that any combination of Lizée and Kanaegami does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted feature either.

For at least the above reasons, Lizée in view of Kanaegami fails to teach or otherwise suggest the present invention having the above-highlighted features as set forth in claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lizée in view of Kanaegami. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 are requested.

Since claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1, and respectively recite additional subject matter. Therefore claims 2-3 should also be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/749,311
Amdt. Dated Oct. 13, 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed July 16, 2007

In view of the above remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
LEE ET AL.

By


Wei Te Chung

Registration No. 43,325
Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859
Foxconn International, Inc.
P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137